

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-43 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-6, 11-15, and 17-22 stand rejected. Claims 7-10 and 16 have been objected to as allowable if rewritten in dependent form, including the limitations of the base and all intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 7. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claim 8 has been amended to change its dependence from claim 7 to claim 1. Claims 23-43 have been added. Claim 22 recites the limitations of originally filed claim 16 in independent form. Claims 23-37 mirror claims 2-15 as originally filed, but are dependent from new claim 23. Claims 38-43 mirror claims 17-22 as originally filed, but are dependent from new claim 23. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Weinberg (U.S. Pat. No. 6,144,962). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has inclusively rejected claims 7-10 based on Weinberg, but provides no grounds of rejection relating to those claims. Also, Applicant notes that the Examiner elsewhere indicates that claims 7-10 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base and intervening claims. Accordingly, applicant presumes that the indication of rejection of claims 7-10 and 16 is erroneous, and responds accordingly.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 7. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claim 8 has been amended to change its dependence from claim 7 to claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 now recites subject matter that the Examiner has indicated is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 7-10 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended base claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 7, and added claim 23, which includes the limitations of claims 1 and 16. Therefore, claims 1 and 23 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug 25, 2004

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GAS/JSB/kp]